

INTRODUCTION OF BILL.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Development and Local Self-Government).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1961 which has been published in the Gazette as required under rule 64 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1961 is introduced.

MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರು (ಬಿಜಾಪುರ).—ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದು ಬಿಜಾಪುರ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯದು, ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವವು. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ದಿನಾಂಕ ಚಲಾಂಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಾ ಇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಾವು ನೋಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಲಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—The Honourable Member is referring to the transfer of the administration of Bijapur municipality. The Government Law enquired into the whole affairs. We have not got the final report. So it is not possible to transfer at present.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರು.—ನಾನು ಕೊಚ್ಚಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಛೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮುನ್ಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯ ಆಡಳಿತವು ಹವಗೆಟ್ಟು ಹೊಲಸಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತುರ್ತಾದ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ನನಗೆ ಊರಿನಿಂದ ಪೋಲಿಸುಗಳು, ತಾರುಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಅದರಮೇರೆ ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ಅದರಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಆನಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಾಗೂರವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವಷ್ಟು ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಯಾರೂ ನಂಬುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರು.—ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸುಮಾರು ಹತ್ತು ಸಾವಿರ ಜನರು ಸಹ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ರುಜುವಾಳು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ರಿಸೈನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಮಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರು.—ನಾನು ಬಿಜಾಪುರವ ಸಿಟಿಮೇಯರ್‌ನವನು, ತಾವು ಜಮಖಂಡಿ ಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಬಿಜಾಪುರದ ಪ್ರಾಂತದ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸರಕಾರದ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೂ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

MYSORE LAND REFORMS BILL, 1961 AS REPORTED BY JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

MOTION TO CONSIDER:—Debate (Cont.)

† Smt. VIJAYA RAGHAVENDER RAO (Chitapur).—Mr. Speaker, sir, I welcome the report that is before us to-day. Many of the Honourable Members have already offered their suggestions with regard to this report. We all agree with the main object and principles of this Bill and some of the valuable and broad suggestions to make this an important piece of legislation. I thank all the members of the Select Committee for having kept before us such a valuable report. I agree with the Select Committee in saying that the ceiling, area, basic holding and the family holding may be determined in terms of the standard acres. Otherwise there would have been a general criticism on the part of the Government if Government had determined it in terms of income of agriculturists. So the land that is cultivated by an individual has been taken into consideration. Then for fixing the ceiling area, they have divided the lands into seven categories and that has been mentioned in Schedule I and in the same way the definition for even the standard acre has also been given in Schedule I. I agree with the Select Committee in saying that the ceiling area should be fixed at 27 standard acres, and also the additional standard acre for the additional member of the family.

So far as the definition of plantations is concerned, it must include arecanut and cocoanut gardens. We are not growing sufficient arecanut in our State. I suggest that arecanut and cocoanut should be included in plantation crop. Coming to Section 17 of the original Bill land standing in the name of the wife of any member of the family which constituted Stree Dhana had been exempted from the ceiling. But the Select Committee has completely deleted this provision. I suggest that the land which constitute Stree Dhana may be exempted from the ceiling and this may be applied to the future holdings. Then, equal facility should also be given to widows, unmarried girls and judicially separated women. I need not emphasize this point more because it is already dealt with by Srimathi Nagarathnamma yesterday. As all are aware, women always need the helping hand of men. I do not understand why the Member of the opposite felt so sorry for the remarks made by her. You all know that women cannot go against nature's law.

“ಜಾತನ್ಯ ಮರಣಂ ಮೃತಂ”

ಹುಟ್ಟಿದವರು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜೀವಿ.

So, the women may be physically fit and mentally alert, but they should be included in Clauses 5, 21 and 67. Clause Seven indicates different dates for different areas for this Act coming into force. I feel that instead of discriminating in this way, we may say that the Bill shall have effect from the date of Jatti Committee Report, because fortune must not favour only the lawyers.

(Smt. VIJAYA RAOHYENDRA RAO)

Coming to the question of compensation, Clauses 47 to 52 deal with compensation and the mode of payment. I suggest that the compensation should be enhanced to 20 times of the $\frac{1}{4}$ of the gross produce of the irrigated land and 20 times of the $\frac{1}{5}$ of the gross produce of the other lands. The mode of payment should be—where it does not exceed ten thousand, it should be paid in lumpsum and where it exceeds ten thousand, the balance should be paid in negotiable bonds carrying five per cent interest.

Coming to co-operative farms, I welcome the idea of co-operative farming and giving special concessions and facilities to these farms. Lastly, lands held by religious institutions and charitable institutions and public trusts for religious and charitable and educational purposes may be exempted from ceiling. As you all know, India is fast moving on the foundations of sacred virtues and values of religious sentiments. Most of us believe in God. The names of persons in other countries, as we could see, will be as Wood, Iron, Black and so on. But, we keep our names as Narmada, Krishna, Godavari, Suryanarayana and Bhadri Narayana and Mahadeva. I always pray God in the Mornings. I pray, 'O God, I pray three to make me a good citizen'. With these words, I welcome the Bill.

† Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, so far as the Select Committee report is concerned, I do not know whether the philosophy of the Indian religion is accepted in this case, because the Revenue Minister has a reference to it. But, it certainly proclaims one aspect of the philosophy of the Congress Party, i.e., the Congress Party is like ADI SETHA. It has got thousand hoods and thousand tongues and it can say anything to everybody. It can be good to the agricultural class, it may be good to the religious institution, it can be good to the land lord. With the thousand tongues, it can say the same thing in thousand ways. Sir, I do not wish to be very uncharitable in respect of the revenue Minister at least because I have personal respect to him as he seems to be very much interested in tenancy reform and land reform. So, also Mr. Muckannappa who was a Member of the Select Committee. So, I do not wish to be very hard on the Select Committee. Taking the over-all position into consideration, I want to make one or two observations to show that the over-all result of the Bill cannot be as revolutionary as it is said to be. My friends on the other side are likely to be very delighted on the efforts made by the Select Committee and the Revenue Minister. It is not going to be a revolutionary measure. Instead of my saying about it anything, it is much better that all those persons who lay so much of emphasis on this bill would go through the review of the land reform by the Planning Commission. Whatever that is said there not only applies to the State but also the various provisions adumbrated in the Bill. For example

on the question of rent it says: "in several States the normal level of rent is still 1/3 of the level of the produce though the law is different.."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—What is it that the Hon'ble Member is reading ?

2-30 P.M.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have taken an extract from the Planning Commission Report reviewing the land reforms in the country.

"on the whole it would be correct to say that in certain areas transfers of land tended to defeat the aims of legislation for ceiling and reduce its impact on the rural economy."

The sum and substance of the review of the Planning Commission is to the effect that ceiling is not very effective because transfers. So far as resumption clauses are concerned, this has resulted in a lot of misery to peasants. On the question of provisions governing tenancy, it has not been very effective. This is the sum and substance of the review of the Planning Commission. At least we should respect the opinion of the Planning Commission because it is fairly impartial body at least in the matter of results whatever may be said about its suggestions. My only fear was that this select committee Report should not be so bad as the Planning Commission wanted to make it to be. Unfortunately, some of the provisions in the Bill go to strengthen the impression that the Planning Commission are perfectly justified when they said that no beneficial results have accrued as a result of these Bills and I can say in respect to this Bill also that no beneficial results would be forthcoming unless measures are taken to amend the clauses.

Firstly, regarding ceiling I need not dwell at length because my friends have already dealt with this question and have shown that the ceiling fixed is too high. The Bill as it stands, all the claims of the Revenue Minister will turn out to be totally at variance with the reality. For example, the Hyderabad Tenancy Legislation, when it came into force, it was expected that one lakh of acres would be available for distribution. Actually, only 4500 acres were available. Even here, the expectations of our Revenue Minister are not likely to be fulfilled, because most of the figures quoted by the Revenue Minister belong to the year 1955. After 1955 so many transfers, so many alienations, so many partitions have been taken and there is likely to be a thorough change in the entire set up and it will completely belive the expectations of the Revenue Minister and there will be no land available for distribution.

Sri T. TARE GOWDA.—Is it wrong to have partitions in a joint family and is it not some times necessiated to discharge family debts ? What is wrong Sir,

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—*Bona fide* transactions cannot be objected. But it is a fact that partitions with a view to defeat the ceiling are taking place and have taken place and Government ought to have taken note of this fact at that time and taken note of it to-day.

Apart from that if the ceiling is 27 acres read with schedule I in which classification of land has been made on an *ad hoc* a basis will defeat the whole idea of getting any land so far as this State is concerned.

You are aware and the Hon'ble Chief Minister is aware and it is always pointed out as though there is some superior wisdom on the part of Maharashtra—the Bombay Legislature, and say that Bombay Legislation is proper. But in this respect I do agree with that sentiment to some extent. The Maharashtra ceilings Bill was passed recently. There the minimum is 18 acres and the maximum is 126 acres of dry land. They have evolved it much more scientifically and their classification of land is also more reasonable. There, it is not merely based on the rainfall, but they have taken the system of irrigation for classification. They say 'flow-irrigation — 2 crops, flow irrigation—one crop and other systems'. Therefore you will kindly see that for purposes of classification, they have taken the system of irrigation not only the rainfall. The Land ceiling Act definitely refers to all these factors—the question of irrigation, the soil fertility and all these things. Each district is classified separately and ceiling is fixed and there the highest limit is not more than 126 acres of dry land, whereas it will be certainly more than 211 acres in this Bill as we have already seen it. If my esteemed friends from Bombay had brought to bear on the select committee the idea they had imbibed due to their association with Bombay, I think they should have taken note of that ceiling. Why they missed it, I cannot understand.

The other point is relating to exemptions. It is a very important provision. In Maharashtra you will kindly see that there is no exemption worth the name except certain lands owned by institution, public trusts—it is not religious institutions. But if it is religious institutions and public trust running any educational institutions and not for profit, running medical relief centre, not for profit, then such land is exempted. I cannot understand why such a thing has not been done here. Here in this Bill there is a total exemption of orchards exemption for efficiently managed farms for plantations in part. I also note that it is not so far as future acquisitions are concerned. So Sir, you will kindly see that so far as exemptions are concerned, it is not on all fours with the legislation enacted either in Maharashtra or Madras. In Kerala also there is no such thing.

Sir, the other point is, three family holdings ought to have been made the ceiling limit. That is another thing. Actually that principle is accepted in one of the sections of the Bill. For example, under resumptions, no landlord is allowed to resume more than three family

holdings. Even for the ceiling there though have been a limit only of three family holdings. Why not that principle be extended to ceilings also I do not see any logic at all in fixing the ceiling so high.

Then so far as the tenancy is concerned, the most important thing in this matter is the definition of the word TENANT itself. My fear is that it is not as wide the Jatti Committee really wanted it to be. Because they wanted to bring in a large variety of tenants. But the present definition tends to exclude a large number of tenants. It is well-known that most of the tenants in Mysore State have no documentary proof to prove their tenancy. They cannot furnish any documentary evidence of their tenancy. Most of it is based on negotiable instruments of the English Law and we have here people who are not able to execute bonds or anything like that. One important mischief which the tenancy legislation seeks to suppress is that so far as tenant is concerned, he is not able to prove his tenancy. 80 per cent of the tenants are not in possession of documentary proof of their tenancies. Naturally, any person who is interested in promoting the interests of the tenants, must take note of this fact and provide for it. But the definition does not take note of this fact that there are oral tenants. Otherwise, you will not be doing justice at all.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I want to know where it is said that oral tenancies should not be recognised.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—They are as valid as written agreement.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—From a reading of the definition of the word TENANT, I gathered that impression. It is not very clear that oral tenancies will be recognised. I am subject to correction. If the Hon'ble Minister assures that that category of tenants are also included and agreements oral written and unwritten are also taken into account, it will be deemed to be sufficiently wide in its scope and I stand corrected.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Will you please read Clause 4 ?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—There is one difficulty : "person lawfully cultivating the land belonging to another person". In the case of subtenants, where the landlord gives the land on sub-tenancy and leases out, there are intermediaries, whether they will get any right under this section, I want to know. The word 'lawfully' always means that the person is engaged in cultivation of another man's land and the burden of proof falls on the tenant that he is lawfully cultivating.

That will create some hardship. The word used is agriculturist not person in the definition, because agriculturist is a person who cultivates the land personally. Why I am saying this is, after the law comes into operation, there should not be any sub-tenancy. But what is to happen to the existing sub-tenants ? In South Kanara for instance, there are a large number of such cases. Is it not necessary to give sufficient protection in respect of this matter is the point that is for consideration.

In respect of the restoration Clause I agree with Smt. Vijaya Desai that different dates need not be mentioned, but I do not agree that it

(Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN)

should be from the date of the Jatti Committee, but it should be from January 1952. There again there is no necessity to ante-date it by 6 years. If a person can produce records from 1916 onwards then he can very well be treated as a permanent tenant. Actually it will be impossible to produce the relevant records and prove one's claim if the dates are to be anterior to 1946. If that is done the object of Clause 7 will be defeated in practice. You say in Clause 7 (3) (a) "surrender and the consent of the tenant was produced by fraud." You have to prove that the surrender has been effected on account of fraud or undue influence. You know that undue influence is not very easy thing to prove.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—What are the ingredients to prove that one is a protected tenant and a lawful tenant?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have given some amendments. It should be from the date on which this Act comes into force. If I am in possession of your land, I must be taken as your tenant and no further explanation is needed. Otherwise the object of the legislation will not be achieved and it will be only a farce. The Kerala legislation has definitely said "on the appointed day."

Then, as far as the clause relating to eviction is concerned, I think it is too wide. For example, take arrears. Nothing is said about past arrears. The clause says "if a man has not paid the rent for two consecutive years on the due date." The due date may be one thing and one need not be meticulous about it. If a person pays it in the course of the year he should be entitled to remain in possession of the land as tenant. This condition put in Clause 22 is too harsh and I do not think it is a fair ground to evict the tenant.

Then the next ground for eviction of tenants is "that the tenant has done any act which is permanently injurious to the land." I know a case where the Revenue Tribunal agreed for the eviction of a tenant on the ground that he had dug up a trench in the field for *bona fide* purposes. So, Sir, I feel that such a clause will be mischievous and there is no point in retaining such a clause here. After all, the tenant and the landlord have to mutually carry on the operation. Now that the legislation is so severe against landlords and so much in favour of tenants, why don't you think of putting some faith in tenants? Why do you want such a clause? Why should not arrears of rent be capable of being recovered as civil debt and why should this extraordinary provision of eviction be here? I am afraid this clause will open the door for large scale eviction. I would suggest that if a person pays at the most two years rent. It should be sufficient for the purpose of payment of past arrears which he is required to pay. A similar clause is to be found in the Kerala Act.

So far as resumption is concerned (Clauses 14 and 16), I am afraid that the provisions in Clauses 14 and 16 are very reactionary. I do not see why there should be any distinction between protected tenants and ordinary tenants. On the appointed day he happens to be a protected tenant by accident of circumstances, because the Government did not think of legislation earlier. If they had accepted the Kumariappa Committee report and legislated, all this discrepancy would not have arisen. All this trouble has arisen on account of the failure of the Congress Party to enact this legislation much earlier when the Party accepted this principle. So far as resumption is concerned, why should there be this distinction between a protected tenant and an ordinary tenant. A protected tenant on the appointed day is entitled to certain rights and privileges. Why should this be specifically conferred only upon protected tenants? Under these provisions whereas an ordinary tenant can be evicted even from a basic holding, a protected tenant cannot be evicted from a basic holding. I am not able to understand this. The justification for saying that a protected tenant should not be evicted from a basic holding appears to be that something must be left with him to make both ends meet. Why should not this consideration be extended to ordinary tenants also? In Madras if a landlord has 13½ acres then he is not entitled to resume not more than 5 acres of wet land from the tenant, but here this legislation takes away even the existing right. Do you call it progressive? Even the Panel of Land Reforms has not advocated this.

Connected with this is the question of "to cultivate personally". The Planning Commission and the Panel on Land Reforms have definitely said that this should include personal labour. Why should it not include personal labour because we are going to see that tenants become landlords and intermediaries are removed?

So far as plantations are concerned, there is a controversy. My friend Shri Mallaradhya wants that plantations should be totally exempted from the provision of ceiling. There is justification for it. Whether it is future acquisition or existing holding, it should not make any difference from the point of view of ceiling. If you can tolerate the existing holding, why can you not tolerate future acquisition also?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—They are already in possession of these lands, but in the case of future holders we have to acquire land and give to new members.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Plantation cannot be grown anywhere and everywhere. It is confined to 3 districts. The crops here are coffee and rubber. There is not much of rubber, but only coffee and you know full well where coffee is grown. Under the land Revenue Code you have enough powers to restrict and regulate the growth of coffee. You can take advantage of that and say that permission shall be given only to such a person and nobody else.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Should there not be any limit or should there be some limit in respect of the future?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—My view is that since it is industry where there is no tenancy question involved, where one person by his own labour cannot cultivate 30 or 40 acres even if he should employ mechanical contrivances and since everything has got to be done by hired labour, I do not see any point in fragmentation of plantations. Fragmentation, on the other hand, is admitted on all sides will lead to deterioration of efficiency and production. If anybody can prove that coffee can be grown more efficiently on a small farm, I will be very glad. I am also opposed to it on the ground that if plantation lands are parcelled out into bits, the Plantation Labour Act would have to be scrapped and this is a central enactment. If they confine to only 100 acres, the Plantation Labour Act cannot be enforced. Small planters do not implement the provisions of the Act. The Central Government and this Government are giving moneys for housing but no planter has come forward to take it because he is unable to invest the money.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When your party is suggesting the nationalisation of all industries and in fact everything on earth, why not nationalise plantations also?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The question of nationalisation is altogether different. We are not legislating for it to-day. My party stands for the nationalisation of land but this is not the stage for it.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—What is the policy of your party. Is it to nationalise land?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Definitely so. But not at this stage. We never asked for nationalisation of land just now. We will do it when we come to power. You will see it (*Laughter*).

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SHETTY.—Is the applicability of the Plantation Act the only difficulty in respect of applying the Reforms Bill to plantations?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The question is one of investment. What is the logic if you apply the ceilings to plantations and all the same exempt orchards, farms with heavy investment etc. What is the difference between orchards and plantations?

So far as the distribution of land is concerned. I am opposed to the principle of giving first priority to co-operative farms. I do not wish to say anything about the co-operative farms and the manner they are being worked now. Neither in the Maharashtra legislation, nor in any other legislation for that matter, first priority is not given to co-operative farms. The Maharashtra act gives first priority to displaced tenants and second to those who are affected by the resumption clause. Third priority is given to co-operative farms. If we give to the

co-operative farms, then no land will be available to the so called landless agriculturists and displaced tenants.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It is also not in consonance with the policy of giving land to the landless.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Certainly so. It will lead to a good deal of delay. The authorities to be will be waiting for co-operative farms to spring up. Some farm will spring up from nowhere and lands will go to it. It is not in keeping with the recommendations of the panel on land reforms or the Planning Commission.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—There may be bogus farms and bogus societies.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA. Of the type of co-operative institutions that are functioning in the State to-day.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not saying anything about the co-operative farms in general. I do not know if this has reference to a co-operative sugar farm.

The existing provision for resumption is contradictory. When the land vests with the State, there is a particular rate. When it vests with the landlord there is a different rate. I am speaking of Clauses 47, 78 and other clauses. This anomaly will have to be set right.

I feel that the compensation fixed at times is rather too high and it should not be more than 6 or 8 times at the most. Otherwise it would not be possible for the tenants to purchase the land. So far as interest is concerned, I do not see why it should be of a standard rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Why should not we not be liberal. The State can be liberal with the tenants. We are getting loans from foreign countries at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent as is instanced in the recent Soviet loan. Why not fix it at 2 per cent. If we fix it at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, within a period of 25 years twice the principal amount would have been paid. This is a social legislation intended to help the down-trodden section of the population.

Sir, in respect of the religious institutions, I am definitely opposed to a blanket exemption being given to them.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—There is no such provision in the Bill.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That may be so now but rumours are thick in the air that an amendment may be brought by the party. Both the sides have spoken softly on this issue and it is possible that Government is re-thinking on the issue. If so we have to fight a loan battle.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.— I want a clarification from Sri-Narasimhan.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—How can he help his flight of imagination?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I have one little satisfaction that atleast the Chief Minister has not said that my statement is wrong.

So far as the religious Institutions are concerned, I agree with the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. I pray his God that he may not let the Minister down. The Maharashtra law does not provide for this kind of exemption and I wonder how my Maharastra friends argued in favour of granting exemptions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member's time is over.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—With this, I would finish, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet again after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Three of the Clock and reassembled at Forty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

(Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the chair.)

† ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಸುಕೀರಾಬಾಯಿ ಹೀರಾಚಂದ್ ಪಾ (ಬಾಗೇವಾಡಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿವಸ ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುವ ಭೂ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ವಿಧವೆಯಾಗಿ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಇರುವುದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನುತ್ತಾ ಅದರ ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸ್ತ್ರೀ ಧನವು ಒಳ್ಳೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಸ್ತ್ರೀ ಧನವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಮತ್ತು ಈ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವಂತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆಯಾದ ಇನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಜಿ.ಪಿ.ಸಮಿತಿಯ ವರದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ವರ್ಷದಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನುಯೂ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸುಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಧರ್ಮಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಸ್ತಿತರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಷಿಯವರು ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ ಮಠಗಳು ಇವಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ನೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ನೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಹೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಧರ್ಮಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಕಾರ್ತವ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಫೀ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗೆ ಹಾಸ್ಟರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಧರ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಪತಿಯಿಂದ ಅವರು ಕೊಡಿಸಿರುವ ಫಂಡಿನ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಅಮೆರಿಕಾ, ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ಪರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಪರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ 15 ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಸಾವಿರವಷ್ಟು ರೊಕ್ಕಾ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಲು ಬಡಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು? ಯಾರುಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು? ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ

ಯಲ್ಲೆ ಚತರಿ ಫಂಡ್ ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಬಿಜಾಪುರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಬೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನಪದವತ್ತು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು, ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತೈದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಧರ್ಮಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸುಮಾರು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಲಕ್ಷ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಬಿಜಾಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಲೆಜುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ವಿವಿಗಳ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಪುರುಷಾದಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಧರ್ಮಾರ್ಥವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೀಲಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಈಗ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯದ ಮತ್ತು ಧರ್ಮದ ಕಾಲ ಇದೆ. ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮದರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸೀಲಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೆವಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೀಲಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಸುಶೀಲಾಬಾಯಿ ಹೀರಾಚೆಂಡ್ ಪಾ.—ಧರ್ಮದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅಂತಹ ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಂಗು ಹಾಕುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕರಾಗಿರುವವರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಧರ್ಮದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮಳೆ ಬಾರದೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ ದೇಶದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲೆಯೂ ಪೂಜೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದುದರಿಂದ ಮೂರು ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಮಳೆ ಬಂತು. ಅಂತಹ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕರಾದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೇಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಪೂಜೆ ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಗೇಣಿದಾರರಿಗೂ ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧ ? (ನಗು)

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಸುಶೀಲಾಬಾಯಿ ಹೀರಾಚೆಂಡ್ ಪಾ.—ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ನೀವು ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಕಾರ್ಲೆಜುಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಬಡತನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹುಡುಗಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಹುಡುಗಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಕಲಿಸಿ ಕಲವರನ್ನು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಅಮೆರಿಕಾ ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಉನ್ನತ ವ್ಯಾಸಂಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಧರ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಪ್ರೀ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗೆ ಹಾಸ್ಟರ್ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಮಧ್ಯಮ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಎಂಟು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಫೀಜನ್ನು ಮಾಹೇಯಾನ ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಸ್ಟಲುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವುಡಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ 40, 50 ಅಥವಾ ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಧರ್ಮದ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಭಾವನೆಯಿಂದ ಇರುವ ಗುರುಗಳು ಇರುವುದು ಬರೆ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಜನರು ಅಂತಹ ಗುರುಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಧರ್ಮವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಧರ್ಮದ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೀಲಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬಾರದು.

ಹಾಗೆ ಸೀಲಂಗಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರುವಂತೆ 27 ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಭೂಮಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತೀರಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಒಡವರಿಗೂ ಜಮೀನು ಮಾಲೀಕರಿಗೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರಿಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇನೆನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಿಸಿ ಈ ನನ್ನ ನಂಬು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR(Kumta).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a few observations on the recommendations of the Select Committee so as to make it more effective and a more appropriate one and welcome the measure. While going through the report, I find that there are several loop-wholes, which' if retained, would result only in ineffectiveness of the purpose for which this legislation is going to be enacted.

The original Bill was drafted on the report of the Jatti Committee, which had toured the whole State and gathered public opinion taking into consideration the various problems in the different parts of the State. But, Sir, some of the important provisions of this Bill have been sufficiently amended and some of them liberally dealt with by the joint Select Committee. On the whole, the Select Committee has not taken into consideration the cases of small holders and particularly, about widows and unmarried women. It looks apparent that the Select Committee wanted to eliminate altogether even concessions granted by the Jatti Committee. Widows and unmarried women were permitted to lease the land under the original Bill and I wonder Sir, what were the compelling reasons which made the Select Committee Members to withdraw these concessions provided in the original Bill. I would also enter a plea in supporting the opinion put forth by the other Hon'ble Lady Members and others in this House at least to provide for future in respect of widows and unmarried women and deserted and judicially separated women. Many have supported this view and a few have strongly objected. I do not say that women are incapable of under taking self-cultivation. But there are very few, in fact very negligent number who can be placed in this category. There may be Sir, one perhaps in a thousand. Single instances should not be taken here while framing such an important Bill. However much we may claim to be socially advanced country, widows and deserted women do not find a place in our society. So, while making such an important legislation, sufficient protection should be given as otherwise more harm will be done rather than good, particularly to these sections. It is a matter of common observation and of course, most of you may not agree with me if I say that man usually tries to have an upper-hand in all matters and try to retain their status. I am sure it will not be so in this case...

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—the Hon'ble Revenue Minister according to a member of select committee is reported to have said that the Constitution makes no distinction between man and women and so they did not want to show and special favour to any one section. That is his defence !

Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR.—But society does not agree.

Many have pointed out Clause 7 (2). This also in my humble opinion would lead to increase litigation. Our experience shows that there are several cases pending in the tenancy court for the last 10 to 12 years. So, I feel that if this is retained, would only lead to increase

in mitigation and as such this may be suitably amended so as to give effect only to such cases after 57.

As regards payment of compensation, I find Sir, that the interest of small holders has not been safeguarded. I would also urge that small holders may be kept in view and their interests also be borne in mind in the payment of compensation.

Coming to the fixation of ceiling on land holdings—here sir, certain categories such as efficiently managed farms, orchards, etc., are exempted from the purview of this clause 63. Sir I had at the time the Bill was being discussed here, made my observation that this clause would lead to favouritism and corruption also. The explanation given is also not satisfactory. When areca and coconut plantations are not granted exemption from ceiling which also require about 10-12 years to come to a stage of yielding crop, requiring heavy investment and also needing regular improvement, the reason put forth for exempting orchards and efficiently managed farms from the purview of the fixation of ceiling is not justifiable one. If however, this concession is deemed necessary, I would also plead for areca and coconut plantations being granted the same eligibility and exempted from ceiling.

Sir, in the original Bill in Clause 70 STRI DHANA was exempted from the ceiling. The Select Committee has deleted this provision. I would request that this may be also included in the Bill.

Last but not the least, about lands belonging to religious institutions. Most of the Members here have also elaborately dealt on this question. I am also one among them in expressing my opinion in favour of exempting such institutions from the purview of this legislation. For that purpose, the lands belonging to religious institutions should be treated as on par with the lands belonging to the State Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Religious institutions managed by single individuals or by trust?

Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR.—Both.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Suppose a religious institution is converted into political arena and the income is used for politics?

Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR.—How can you mingle politics with religion?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—These religious institutions create politicians. Sometimes they create leaders also. Sometimes, they appoint Ministers also.

Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR.—Sir, these institutions should be treated on par with Government lands and exemption granted to State Government lands should also be made applicable to the lands owned by the religious institutions. That is my opinion. As you are aware the income derived by these institutions is fully utilised for

(Smt. V. V. MIRJANKAR)

educational institutions or hostels etc in some cases in running samskruta patasalas and as such, I would also be one amongst them in pleading for the right cause.

With these words, I thank you Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak, on this subject.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಈಗ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇರೆ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ದಿಫರ್ ಆದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರೂ ಸಹ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರ ಮೇಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೂ ನಾನಾವಿಧವಾದಂತಹ ಟೀಕೆ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ್ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯಾ ರೀತಿ ವರದಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿವರಿಸಿ ರಿಪ್ಲೈಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಎಂ. ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್.—ಮಿಸ್ಟರ್ ರಿಪ್ಲೈ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯ.—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ, ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲಾದರೂ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹಿಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗಿವೆ. ಅದು ಒಂದು ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ. ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂತಹವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

4-00 P.M.

Only those members of the Select Committee who have given dissenting notes can speak. That is the convention.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I think the Speaker is correct. Ordinarily the members of the Select Committee are not allowed to speak unless they have given dissenting notes.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—It is not mentioned so in the rules of procedure.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, land reforms is one of the most difficult subjects in any country, much more so in this country. It is very difficult to speak with any authority of any single panacea for the problem of land. With what little study I have made of reforms in the communist countries like Yugoslavia and Israel things have gone on changing. What was considered an ideal reform in some countries has undergone several changes; experiments are being considered for the purpose of evolving an ideal reform. We ought not to be hasty in coming to any conclusion. There are two important things adumbrated in the report of the Planning Commission and they are removal of social exploitation and increase in food production. As you just now said, Sir I am not in a position to comment upon all aspects of the report. I have differed mainly on a few things. The

most important thing that bedevils any Government while bringing any land legislation is the question of ceiling. We have after a lot of thinking and re-thinking fixed a ceiling of 27 acres. The planning Commission have said that it is a little bit too much. I have read from their observations. They have not said exactly how many a res it should be but they have referred to Hyderabad Karnatik. Possibly, their idea is 3 family holdings. I believe any family of husband, wife and 3 children can get enough income from 18 to 20 acres for a decent livelihood. This is the first category of land which can produce two and sometimes three crops. I entirely agree with the statement made by a member on the other side that the present land reforms favour the big landlords more than the small landholders. If we just see the classification of lands under the first category, the ceiling for a family is 27 acres. Under the second category it is 30 acres, third category 45 acres, 4th category 54 acres, 5th category 103 acres, 6th category 162 acres and 7th category 216 acres. I found that the gentlemen who wanted this classification are more vehement than others in opposing any concessions being given to small landholders. If we closely examine the classification of land, we will see that in very many areas of the State there will be very little land left. It will be possible for a family to hold 1,000 acres. We can see that a family divides itself. If it becomes double it can hold 432 acres of land. If it is a big family it can divide itself still further and even if there are 1,000 or 2,000 acres of land they can hold all the lands for themselves without letting a single acre of land go out of their hands. This is the classification arrived at. I had my own objection to this classification. I am not expected to disclose what happened in the Committee, but I would say that this classification is unscientific and unjust. If the Minister really considers this, he will see that at least in certain parts of the State very little will be left for tenants. Take for example the case in Madras. They have scientifically divided the land on the basis of assessment. The difficulty arises here because it may be argued that we have no scientific basis of assessment at all and so it is not possible to evolve a scientific basis. As a result of this my district of South Kanara which has got a scientific assessment will suffer. According to this classification my district will come in the 4th class namely, "wet land or garden, land other than First, Second or Third Class land, irrigated by rain water..." This was not the recommendation of the planning Commission. Unfortunately, all these types of land are clubbed together in the 4th class. In the Madras area first class land is land paying an assessment of Rs. 10 to 12, second class paying an assessment of Rs. 4 to 5 and third class paying an assessment of Re. 1, but under this classification that we have before us all these lands are clubbed together. Now a person can get first class land 27 acres paying an assessment of Re. 1 and another person can get as first class land 27 acres paying an assessment of Rs. 12 because all these lands are clubbed together in one

(Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

category. That is the scientific basis on which we are framing this Bill? I am very sorry to say that I disagree with this classification. This will do great injustice to certain areas in the northern parts of the State where people can hold thousands of acres. I am for the modification suggested by the planning Commission. I have said in my dissenting note that not more than 20 acres should be allowed. The Planning Commission have said 18 acres, but we are prepared for 20 acres. If it is 20 acres the ceiling will be not more than 160 acres. If it is 18 acres it will be still less. So I would submit that it should be made 18 or at the most 20 acres. Otherwise the District of South Kanara will be subjected to great injustice because we have got a regular and scientific basis of assessment of lands.

I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister; I had insisted on several occasions; let him get the Bill examined and see that a provision is included in the Act which provides for future arrears, not past arrears. The Kerala Bill provides for past arrears, but there is no mention of it in our Bill.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—What is your suggestion with regard to past arrears?

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—A limit of two years should be prescribed. Let no landlord get more than two years' arrears of rent from any tenant.

With regard to religious institutions, we were all clear about the issue. The Planning Commission has suggested one amendment which seems to be a little dangerous. I will narrate one incident. One very big religious institution came and claimed that more than thousand acres were in its possession, not a bit of it in the hands of the tenants, that all the lands extending more than 1,000 acres were self-cultivated. It is impossible for it to have cultivated so many acres, yet it insisted that this vast number of acres were in its possession. I am not aware whether the weighty gentlemen sitting in Delhi do not know the conditions existing in our parts. It is a very dangerous piece of advice they have given. We shall not accept it. If we say that every institution shall be examined before the Act becomes law, they will take into possession all these lands, if they have not already done it. The majority of the institutions have already taken possession of the lands. If they have not already done it, they will take possession of all the lands and claim exemption. That is the state of affairs. I hope the Revenue Minister and the Government have not changed the view in this matter and that we will stick to the point of view which we have come to in the Select Committee.

One discussion yesterday and to-day also veered round the injustice done to women. We have considered this thing very carefully and I feel that no injustice was done to any women. As my friend said, we

did not consider that women are worse or better than men. We considered them equal. We know women fight for equality and perfect equality was accorded in the Bill and no special treatment was given to them. I do not know if in the guise of special concessions women are favoured to any extent. There are other varieties of interests which come into the picture and say that they ought to be helped also. We have considered the issue and felt that widows and unmarried girls might be given some concession. That is the view our party has come to with regard to women; but with regard to Stridhana and other things we could not go to that extent.

We have already come to certain conclusions. I am not saying that we have produced an ideal Report or an ideal Bill. As I said, the land reform is such that it is not possible to produce any ideal solution to this problem; but the Government of course have lagged behind; of course, they are now hurrying. I am worried whether they will be able to pass it and get the consent of the President. In Kerala what happened was, the communists party tried to bring an Act which they thought was good. Most of the elements opposed it up to the President. What happened was, it took more than 1½ years to get it passed again it was sent back to the Assembly and passed. Let not the Government feel that they can over-ride and get the consent of the President. It is possible to learn from other States and see that this thing is not repeated. These mistakes need not be committed. These are things which will help all people. So I suggest that some of the things which our party have suggested and in the dissenting note I have suggested these things may be considered and suitable amendments brought in the Bill.

Sri T. TARE GOWDA.—I want to know the opinion of my friend regarding religious and charitable institutions.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—We have already come to a decision and I adhere to that opinion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬ್ಲಿ.—(ಕುಾವಗೋಷ್ಠಿ) ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥನೆ, ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣಾ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತೂರ್ವಿಕವಾದ ಅನುದಾನದ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯ ತೋರಿಸಿ. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣಾ ವಿಧೇಯಕವು ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಜನಾಂಗದ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ವಿಧೇಯಕವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ 75 ಮಂದಿ ಈ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ನಿರತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾರಣ ಇದು ಜನಾಂಗದ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ವಿಧೇಯಕ ಎಂದು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಿ. ರೇವಣಗೌಡ.—ನರ್ವ ರೋಗ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಇದ್ದುಹೋಗಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಚಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬ್ಲಿ.—ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವಂಥವರು 75 per cent ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರೊಳಗೆ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಜನಾಂಗ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ, ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ, ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇತರೆ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೂ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗ, ಬದಗಿ, ಕುಂಬಾರ, ಕನ್ಯಾಕಾರ್ಥಿ ದರ್ಜೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಎಲ್ಲ ಉದ್ದೇಶಗಳಿಗೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೇರಿ 75 per cent ನಷ್ಟು ಮಂದಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬ್ಲೆ)

4-30 P. M.

ಹ್ವಾರೆಂದು ರೆಕ್ಕ ತೆಗೆವರೆ ಅದು 40-50 per centಕ್ಕೆ ಇಳಿದು ಧೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು, ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಒಕ್ಕಲುತನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಒಕ್ಕಲಿಗರ ಜನಾಂಗ ಒಂದಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಒಂದಾನೊಂದು ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಬಿಡುವರು. ಅದಕಾರಣ ಅವರು ಇದು ಉದ್ಯೋಗ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ ಈ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಪ್ರಾಂತ್ಯದೊಳಗೆ 1939 ರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಬಂದರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ 1959ಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ, 16 ವರ್ಷ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೋಲಾಹಲವೆದ್ದು ಈಗ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪುನಸ್ತಿ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಮಂದಿ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಟೀಕೆ ವಿಘೇಯಕ ವಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಮಾತಿನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದೊಳಗೆ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಈ ಧೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. 64 ದಿವಸವೇ ಕೂಡಲೆ, 4^{ನೇ} ಮಂದಿಯೇ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಇಂತ್ಯಂತ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೂ ಇದ್ದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಮಾಪತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ. ಈ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ರೈತರಿಗಿಂತ, ವ್ಯವ ಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗಿಂತ, ಜಮೀನುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಾರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಉಪಕಾರ, ಸಹಾಯ ಆಗುವಂತೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ನೇರವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜಮೀನುದಾರರುಗಳಿಂದ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಪುಕ್ಕಟೆಯಾಗಿ ಕರೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಾರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರೆಕ್ಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಇಷ್ಟು ಕಂಟಿನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರಾರ್ಡುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ನನ್ನ ಟೀಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಅಡ್ಡಿಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜಮೀನುದಾರರು, ಜಹಗೀರುದಾರರು ತಾಳುವ ದೋರಣೆ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ 75 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಭದಾಯಕವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟವಾದರೂ ಅವನ್ನು ಸಹಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನೊಳಗೆ 27 ಸ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ ಅದು, 18 ಎಕರೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ರೈತನನ್ನು ಎರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷ ಎಂದಿರು ವುದನ್ನು, ಮೂರು ವರ್ಷ ಎಂದು ಇಡಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನ ವಗೈರೆ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನಾಯಿತೆಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏನು ಕೆಲವರು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾರಮು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕರಿದಾರ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಏನಾಯಿತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬ್ಲೆ.—ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಮಾಡುವಂತೆಯೇ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ವಿ. ರೇವಣಸಿದ್ಧಪ್ಪ.—ನಿರ್ಮಯರಿಗೆ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಕಂಬ್ಲೆ.—ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು.

ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂಜೆಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿವಹಿಸಿ, ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು.

ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ, ರೈತನಿಗಿಂತ ಜಹಗೀರುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ, ಸಾರ್ವಕ ಒದಗಿಸು ತ್ತದೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಜಹಗೀರುದಾರರು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಹತ್ತೂರ್ದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕು. ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make few observations on the report of the Joint Select Committee. This measure of land reforms is under discussion for the last few years. There has been inordinate delay in bringing this Bill. At the Nagpur Session of the Congress, a resolution was passed asking the Congress Governments to go through land reforms legislation before the year 1959. That direction of the Congress Supreme Body has not been implemented by this Government. Sir, land reforms are long overdue in our country. The aim of this reform is to make the tiller owner of the soil. The slogan of the reforms is, 'land to the tiller'. Now our country is wedded to social pattern of society. The period of French Revolution and the period of socialistic revolution are the two different ages in the human history. There is whole period of history between these two resolutions. Sir, at present, our country is passing through an age which may be called as agrarian revolution. So land reforms is one of the measures to work out this agrarian revolution. We are passing through this and we are trying to catch up the socialistic revolution. So, we have to cross over this whole period within a very span of time. But, here, this Government and this ruling party have been trying to delay in the matter of land reforms. Sir I do not know why the Revenue Minister has been so very apologetic in presenting the report of the Select Committee.

At the end of his statement Sir, he has been very apologetic and he has invoked the blessings of God and Indian philosophy. As a matter of fact he need not have been so apologetic. I can very well appreciate the difficulties in the way of our Hon'ble Revenue Minister whom I presume to be a progressive gentleman in the congress fold. He is bound by the Party discipline. But unfortunately this progressive gentleman had to fight with reactionary forces in his own Party.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Health Minister is not under discussion now.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR—And in that fight, Sir, which he tried to put up with reactionary forces in his own Party and in his own Government, the Hon'ble Revenue Minister unfortunately yielded to the pressure of the landlords and reactionary forces. I have got full sympathy with him. He has said in his statement that it is not possible to give satisfaction to all concerned. I am sure Sir, this legislation which is before us would satisfy to a great extent the landlord class in the State. They would be very much pleased with the report of the Select Committee. The balance is tilting and has certainly tilted heavily on the side of the landlords. Let me submit here Sir, that this Bill is not socialistic measure as suggested by the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. Let us be very clear in our ideas. Socialism or socialistic policy means of production and distribution should be exchanged. It envisages the nationalisation of land. But these land reforms cannot be called socialistic in that sense. The aim of land reforms is investing

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

the individual ownership of the land with the tiller of the soil to make the tiller of the soil the owner of the soil itself. At best, it may be a step on the way to socialism. To put it in proper context, it is a step in the direction of co-operative economy or co-operative farming that is being aimed at present.

Secondly Sir, the Hon'ble Minister refers to Indian philosophy and says that Indian philosophy is socialistic philosophy I should humbly submit Sir, I disagree with the Hon'ble Revenue Minister. In my opinion, Indian philosophy is anything but socialistic philosophy. It is an individualistic philosophy—it aims at individual *moksha*

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is just like *Gijendra Moksha* !

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—‘*Sarvejanah sukhinobhavanthu*’ is only a pious wish of the Hon'ble Minister. Unfortunately it can never materialise in actual life. By such measures as land reforms we are trying to materialise this pious wish ‘*sarvejanah sukhinobhavanthu*’. In this twentieth century we need not go as far back as the days of Upanishads for it is Indian philosophy. In this 20th century we are trying by such measures to materialise by democratic means. This is altogether a new project, it is a modern project which cannot be found in the Indian philosophy. When we make this remark Sir, we should be very clear in our ideas. I do not wish to dilate on this any further.

Sir, land reforms are essentially agro-economic reforms. Sir, in the words of the Planning Commission it should establish a stable Rural economy and will lead to the establishment of agrarian economy based predominantly on peasant ownership. This is what is aimed at. But the question is, does this reform outline this intention of the planners? How this is going to be achieved? That has also been made abundantly clear by the Planning Commission. To put it briefly, the objects of this reform are three-fold. I am quoting the Planning Commission :

1. Increased agricultural production in the country ;
2. Establishment of direct relationship of the cultivator with the State in other words, abolition of all intermediaries ;
3. Conferment of ownership on the tiller of the land—that is, ‘land to the tillers ;

To quote the words of Planning Commission, it is putting an end to all vestiges of tenant-landlord relationship. That is the main object of this land reform. To put an end to all vestiges of landlord tenant relationship is the logical consequence of land reforms. Every tiller should become the owner of the soil and the master of the soil. The Bill in the present form will have to be viewed and examined from that standard. If you analyse the Bill from that view point, I regret to

say that this Bill is far from satisfactory. The Bill fails to achieve these three objectives of the land reforms. There is nothing in the Bill which confers the right of ownership on the tenant. There is nothing in the Bill which puts an end to the relationship between the landlord and the tenant. The main object is to shelve and a permanently shelve this reform.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Shelve in whose interest?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—In the interest of the Congress! Sir, I may be permitted to bring to the notice of this House the steps taken by Bombay to enforce these objectives. But before that, I will draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members of this House to the report on the Investigation Work on Land Reforms in the Bombay State. Two research scholars belonging to the Gokhale School of Politics and Economics, Sri V. M. Dande and Sri J. G. Coondapur, investigated on behalf of the Planning Commission the working of the Bombay Tenancy Act, 1948 for a period of five years and when they investigated conditions of working in the various parts of the Bombay State and also in the four districts of Bombay Karnatak. They have come to certain conclusions. They came to the conclusion that this Act was ineffective, the objects of the Act were not achieved. There was failure in the implementation of its provisions. In their own words, the Act did not exist for all practical purposes. In short, the Act failed. That was the verdict. Bombay State was the first to enact this legislation. Bombay State had a definite and positive bias towards the tenant class. In spite of this, the Act failed in the Bombay State. If this is the case in a progressive State like Bombay, what would be the position here in this State?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Progressive legislation or progressive State?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I can say both. It is not only progressive, it is radical also. I may point out here Sir, that all the memoranda that we have received in this regard was from the landlord class, not from the tenant class.

I do not remember to have received a single memorandum from the tenant class.

As I was saying, this Act could not be a successful Act in Bombay State. The conditions here are quite different. There is a positive bias in the administration as well as in the legislation towards the landlord class. The landlord class is still very powerful in the State. In Bombay State the tenant class defeated the landlord class about 20 years ago. What would be the position here by passing this legislation, I wonder. I may again refer to the Report on Investigation by the Gokhale School of Politics and Economics. In their findings they have strongly supported the amendments that were brought by the Government to the 1956 Bombay Act. The first amendment is to the

(Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR)

effect that rent should be paid in cash. Share renting is abolished there. For the benefit of members I may quote from the amendments proposed:

"It is now laid down that rent should be paid in cash only. Share renting is abolished. Maximum rent is defined as as 5 times the assessment or Rs. 20 per acre whichever is less, but in no case less than 2 times the assessment. The tenant is made liable to pay land revenue, irrigation cess and local board cess. This has brought the tenant into contact with the Government."

The second amendment was about the right of resumption of land by landlord being limited to the ceiling area. Here also it is limited to the ceiling area, but the limit of ceiling area has been put at a very high figure.

Similarly, there resumption was restricted to half of the leased area. So the tenant is assured under any circumstances of half of the land leased to him. But there is no such restriction in this Bill.

Then the most important amendment in the Bombay Act was that by which tenants get unqualified right to purchase the lands they cultivate. The tenants on a certain day (1st April 1957) were deemed to have purchased the land. That means on that day the tenant in Bombay State has automatically become the owner of the land he cultivates. 1st April 1957 was observed throughout the State as tillers' day. That was the happiest day for the tillers in that State. These amendments were meant to seal the loopholes and defects in the Act and to facilitate the quick transfer of Agricultural lands in the hands of the cultivators. Unless such a measure is adopted in this State, the object of our land reforms would not be achieved. There should be provision for tenants obtaining unqualified right to own land. In the absence of such a provision, the Bill is bound to be ineffective.

Now I will turn to some of the defects in the Bill. Ceiling limit is placed too high. 27 standard acres is the greatest concession given to landlords in this Bill. This comes to $4\frac{1}{4}$ times the family holding. The Planning Commission has recommended that 3 times the family holding should be the proper limit. I support all the Hon'ble Members who have spoken before me in this respect that the ceiling limit should be restricted to 3 times the family holding. The maximum should be 18 standard acres. By putting the ceiling limit at 27 standard acres very little surplus land will remain, about 2 lakhs as mentioned by the Minister. That is practically nothing. There is a saying in Marathi. It means that by digging a whole mountain you found only a small rat. After all these efforts, what has been found is that the ceiling limit has been placed at 27 standard acres. That is the greatest concession shown to landlords. This will defeat the very purpose of imposing ceiling limit. My friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty already

pointed out the ceiling limit in Kerala which is quite low. In Bombay it was 12 acres and 48 acres. Now they have again passed the Ceiling Act to which a reference was made by my friend Sri Narasimhan. The ceiling area is from 18 acres to 126 acres, but here in our Bill the range is very wide and it ranges from 27 acres to 216 acres. I fully agree with my friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty that the classification is not scientific.

Sri B. G. KHOR.—In what respects it is not scientific?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—The Maharashtra Government has fixed ceiling limit for each and every area in all the districts. They have taken into consideration the soil conditions, the income and produce and various other things. Those factors should be taken into consideration and the ceiling should be fixed here also.

Then coming to personal cultivation, there is a provision for resumption for personal cultivation. In this respect the present leaves many loopholes for resumption by landlords under the guise of personal cultivation. This provision for personal cultivation is very defective. The condition of residence within a ten mile limit that was in the original Bill is also removed now. Residence in the village during the main agricultural season must be made compulsory for personal supervision. This factor should be taken into consideration.

5-00 P. M.

About surrender. The experience in the past years show how bogus surrenders are common. An investigation report has also mentioned and given details of this practice. The surrenders will have to be carefully and strictly observed. The Planning Commission has suggested that the surrenders should be regulated. This suggestion should be carried out.

The successful working of this legislation depends upon its implementation. For this a very efficient and effective machinery is required. Our experience is that there have been failures in the implementation of land reforms. Government should take all necessary precautions and create such an administrative machinery that will be able to successfully implement the provisions of this enactment. Mere passing of the law will not serve the real purpose. The legislation will have to be backed up by giving facilities of credit and finance to the cultivators and tenants. This factor should not be ignored. The co-operative organisations should give credit and supply finance.

Sri A. R. PANCHGAVI.—Sir, I rise to support the report of the Select Committee. I was a member of the Select Committee

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Has he signed a note of dissent?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—He had 64 sittings and one year in which he could exhaust himself. Why should he waste 20 minutes here?

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—A member of the Select Committee is not really prevented from speaking in this House. There seems to be some convention, though I am not sure of it. If the Hon'ble Member has got to say something regarding certain points or answer criticisms he should be allowed to speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—This has been decided previously. Unless he has given a dissenting note, he cannot speak here. That will have to be observed.

Sri S. D. KOTHAWALE.—There is no such rule in the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri C. M. Arumugham will speak now.

† **Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.**—Sir, I have heard many speeches with interest. I would mainly speak on this question of ceiling. My first question is : why should there be ceiling at all. In this Bill, is the ceiling on land or is it on income. The basic concept behind land reforms seem to be to redistribute land. Is this redistribution intended to achieve the objective of increasing agricultural production or is it to satisfy everyone who wants to possess some bit of land. Obviously, land reforms are designed to bring about greater production.

In the First and Second Five-Year-Plans, we have spent huge sums on agriculture. In your own constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a project called Lakkavali project. Probably you are aware of that... (*laughter*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He is a very interesting personality. Of late he is becoming very famous (*laughter*).

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, the Lakkavali project costs 33 crores. Likewise many projects are coming up. The Tungabhadra project would cost us 100 crores when completed. All these are intended to step-up food production. But after the working of two plans, has production increased and have we achieved the much-desired self-sufficiency in respect of foodgrains. No. We are importing foodgrains heavily. From 1948 to 1958 our Country has imported foodgrains to the extent of 3,27,88,000 tons of foodgrains at a cost of 1.426 crores. The latest agreement with the U. S. A. for importing 17 million tons of foodgrains in the next four years would cost us 600 crores. Therefore this self-sufficiency drive has ended in failure. Now it is stated that re-distribution of land will result in higher production. But such redistribution should not make everybody poor. There is no use of having a small uneconomical holding. Article 39 of the Constitution says that the ownership and control of the material sources shall be so distributed as to best subserve common good. If you redistribute land would it serve the best common good?

The other point is:

“that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment.”

If that is the reason, if the concentration of these lands in a few individuals is going to be detrimental to the interests of the country, I agree; but on what basis they are fixing the ceiling or limit, I do not understand. I am told that a great man of this country earns about a lakh of rupees or so per month, being Chairman for half a dozen companies; he is simply an adviser. When you allow him to earn so much, why do you fix a limit on the income of the agriculturist. If you say that you want to increase production, what is the increase in production you have made and what is it that you are going to do under the Third Five Year Plan. I have a little information which I want to tell you and through you to the Government. In 1956-57, the area under paddy cultivation was about 19,10,000 acres of land. But according to the latest figure, for 1957-59 or 1958-60, it is 23,62,000 acres. That means an increase of 4.5 lakhs of acres of land which have been brought under paddy cultivation. Likewise ragi. Of course, Ragi is very famous in the old Mysore area. I do not know whether you have tasted it or not; but it does not matter. In 1956-57, the area under Ragi cultivation is 19,14,000 acres of land; but the latest figure is 25,88,000 acres of land; that means an increase of 6 lakhs of acres brought under Ragi cultivation. Likewise, Jowar and wheat. What is the production? So far as paddy is concerned, in 56-57 it was 1,02,500 tons; but the latest figure is 12,93,000 tons. The production has increased by 2.75 lakhs of tons of rice. But with all that, is it possible for the State to become self-sufficient in foodgrains? After all, everybody likes to own land. You impose so many conditions--personal cultivation, he must reside within a certain area and so on. What for is it, do you distribute the land among the landless or you distribute the land to every one who desires to cultivate the land. I consider land reforms to comprise two things, namely distribution of land the other is tenancy; the two are mixed together and called land reforms. Strictly speaking, it is going to bring no reforms to the land; only distribution of agricultural land and tenancy.

For fixing the ceiling, I am asking the Government as to what are the basic factors taken into consideration. They say 27 standard acres. Is it possible for every family to cultivate 27 standard acres or as others put it, about of 7th class for a family consisting of five members or more. If that is the case, why do you say basic holding, why do you say 'family holding'. If you say that 216 acres is the reasonable extent of land one can possess, then why do you bring this nasty family holding, nasty basic holding. I am simply worrying myself as to whether I am wrong or Mr. Jatti is wrong in submitting this report or the is genuine or bogus. If you say genuine, I will tell you what is the extent of land we are having in the State. According to the Jatti Committee Report, persons who are holding land upto 5 Acres and 30-45 Acres of land are 96.74 per cent. but the extent of land they hold is 74.46 per cent. The other 4 per cent of persons are having 26 per cent of lands. I do not know on what basis we can say

(Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM)

that 2 lakhs of tenants are going to be benefited, to what extent. This Committee had 64 sittings. I am surprised to see that they had 64 sittings, The State of Gujarat newly formed brought such a measure; but that Committee had only three sittings. You can kindly go through the Gujarat land reforms. I am not criticising the members of the Joint Select Committee. I know it was dragged on for some months on account of some persons. I am willing to point out this during election time. I am going to my constituency and say that that man was against it. Some friend of mine, a true Congress member asked, when Bombay introduced land reforms about 14 years back, what made you wait for 14 long years and delay the matter further by one year. When you say basic holding is two acres according to 7th class, it becomes 16 acres. Sir, I would now like to know, out of the land that is expected to get by way of this reform, the number of acres which could be classified as first class land, third class land second class and so on. Is it possible for the Chief Minister to tell us about this? Is it possible to say that 2 standard acres is equal to so many acres of 7th class land? So, Sir, I wonder how they got this figure to show that so many lakhs of land would be available for distribution after the implementation of this reform.

Then, Sir, they have fixed the ceiling of 27 standard acres. They have also given exception to lands which are said to be efficiently managed and efficiently cultivated. In such an event, everybody will say that he has been managing his land efficiently; who is to judge? And there is no ceiling fixed for such efficiently cultivated land. May I know whether you are allowing these efficiently cultivated lands plus 27 standard acres according to the ceiling to a family?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA. That is not the intention.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Where is it stated here? Is there any provision in the Bill to say that it is not allowed? Persons can divide their families, each to contain more than five and divide the lands at the rate of 27 standard acres to each family. In addition to this efficiently cultivated land is also allowed. Then, where is the land available for distribution to the landless? Sir, is this a land reform I ask. Is this done on any rational basis?

Then, Sir, in respect of plantation, I have no objection to exempt plantation. But, is there any provision in this Bill to restrict that the planter shall not hold these 27 standard acres? Sir, when all these exemptions are there, I do not know how this reform is going to help the poor people. After all these exemptions, you will not be able to get any land to distribute to the poor. Then, Sir, you say that 27 standard acres would be necessary for a family to lead a good living. When that is so, in what way would help a person if 2 or 3 or 4 acres are given to

him? How can he make his life comfortable with the income out of these bits of lands? Instead of that, wherever it is possible, they must from what are called Government Farming. After the resumption of the land, if there is any surplus land they must form Government Farms as they have in the industrial field.

Otherwise, in farms like Hesaraghatta where have 10,000 birds and only 2,000 eggs! Nobody knows what happens to the other eggs. I was told the birds also are eating eggs there! Sir, I am only concerned with this aspect in the whole of your Land Reform—can you make three blades of grass grow where only one grew before? either through co-operative farming or through Government farms. If that is the case, I do not think you will find this poverty in the rural parts, and people craving for lands. In Bidar and Gulberga, they have what is called the Giron lands. The gomal lands here are called as Giron lands. Everyday people are occupying and every day you are asking them to vacate. Why? It is on account of poverty. What should be done in order to remedy? They must be given proper wages to sustain them. Agricultural labour must be treated on par with industrial labour.

5-30 p.m.

The other point is, if in a family, they have any other income—if the son of a family is on I.A.S. or I.C.S. officer, you will allow him to have 27 standard acres. What I say is, if a family there is an I.C.S. or I.A.S. or I.P.S. officer, you must reduce his ceiling. Let us have some basic understanding. If compact blocks of 50 acres and 100 acres are to be permitted as well-managed farms why do you prescribe a ceiling? I want to say that the property of this country should be equally distributed among the people.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—If the Hon'ble Member yields, I would like to clarify. With regard to a family where a Member of the family is an I.C.S. or I.A.S. or I.P.S. officer, the Hon'ble Member says do not give any land. But I put him a question: suppose he dies, will it be resumed and more lands granted to the family?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—If he dies, the family gets pension. How to distribute the country's wealth? That is the question before us. You consider all the means of production. You are always up against the agricultural lands. You are having a concentration of lands in the rural areas. What about the urban parts also? People are saying that there is communism, socialism—is there anything like Manjappaism?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is not necessary.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I am sorry to state there is no ISM in the State except communalism! We ourselves accept that all except onis community in the entire population is backward! For the purpose of admission to colleges, we want to call ourselves backward. What about

(Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM)

the distribution of land?—backward, less backward and more backward is there anything like that?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—50 per cent will be reserved for backward classes.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—In this question of land distribution also, if you bring in the name of Dr. R. Nagan Gowda, what should be done? For everything communalism is there. The best thing is, every one in this country must be provided with a job and employment. If it is land, he must have sufficient land to sustain his family. If it is appointment, he must be enabled to maintain his family. The state must take the responsibility to look after the entire population and their welfare. Otherwise this land reform or anykind of reform will not help our country and our State. We will be becoming poorer and poorer day by day. I do not know when we going to repay our loans in the foreign countries.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—God takes care of everybody.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Are we in a position to repay our debts? With all this, why are people after land? As it is, prices are going high and there is no scheme to control prices. If only people can get rice, ragi and wheat cheaper in the market, nobody will go for lands. If a minimum price was assured to the agricultural producer, he will not crave for more land. Mr. Rachiah talks lots of things about agriculture. What is the maximum and what is the minimum necessary for each family Sir? Can he by any means either by adopting the best Japanese method produce in one acre, what is not being produced in 10 acres? Our population is increasing day by day and year by year. Is land also expanding in a like proportion? Is there anybody to create land Sir? You cannot destroy the forests and give away those lands for cultivation. Forest wealth is very necessary. Therefore, how should it be settled is the matter for consideration. You must look after everybody in the State.

One other point as my friend suggested some exemption should be given to the lands held by the religious institutions and educational institutions. Manufacturing liquor for sacramental purposes has been allowed under the Prohibition Act! Not merely the use of liquor, they are permitted to manufacture the special varieties of liquor. One can make illicit liquor, foreign or country liquor. You have allowed it. In the same way, why not you allow the lands held by religious institutions also for sacramental purposes? Why not you exempt those lands? My humble submission in this is Sir, that so long as religious institution spends the entire proceeds for the welfare of students and in the interest of education and other welfare activities, I am of the view that it should be exempted. It is for your consideration. But then, there are some religious institutions and they control political parties and they interfere in politics. What should happen to such institutions?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—They begin to rule the country.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Therefore what should be done? They must see that they should not interfere with politics. What I am saying is that it may be considered that if any religious institution is running an educational institution and if they do not interfere in politics, its case may be considered for exemption. Sir, I can say that in 1957 elections, Churches said in their Prayer meetings that you must vote for congress. They also rang the Bell and at that time said: 'you must vote for the Congress'. Such institutions, we cannot exempt. On such a plea we cannot exempt. They should not indulge in or control politics and they should not set up candidates for elections.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—How do you enforce it?

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The Congress Government can bring in a Bill for the purpose. It is not new to them. They will make possible what is not possible and what is possible they will say is not possible.

With these remarks I conclude. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri Y. Veerappa.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It was understood that the general discussion on this Bill should end to-day and from to-morrow we should take up the clause by clause discussion. There is no indication from the Revenue Minister or the Whip of the Party about it. We are eager to hear the Minister's reply. It is nearing six o'clock. So, are we going to take up the clause by clause discussion to-morrow without the Minister's reply to the general discussion?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The necessary motion will be made to-morrow.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If the Minister says that the general discussion will go on to-morrow also and the time allotted for discussion of the Bill clause by clause is not going to be reduced, I have nothing to say.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When we wanted the time to be extended, you fixed 20 minutes as the time limit and pointed out the difficulty for extension of the time. Now nobody is there to speak and so where is the need for us to extend the time. I would request you now to call upon the Minister to reply so that to-morrow the clause by clause discussion can take place.

Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA.—There are many members to take part in the debate and so the time may be extended by another day.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The correct thing is so for the Revenue Minister to move for extension of the time for this Bill by one day.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In view of the fact that there are a number of speakers on this side and some speakers on the other side, the intention was to see that the general discussion continues to-morrow also. To-morrow I will make the appropriate motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When the same point was pressed by Sri Narasimhan by way an amendment to the Report of the Business Advisory Committee it was not accepted then. What is it that the Government now wants to extend the time on some plea or the other? It was on this very point that there was some quarrel between us and the Leader of the Opposition. I request the chair to stick to the ruling then given by it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He can speak on the motion when it is made to-morrow.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I only indicated that I would move the motion to-morrow.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—To-morrow the clause by clause discussion has to take place. The general discussion has to close to-day. I do not think the Revenue Minister can reply within 10 minutes.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA I never said that I will make a reply within 10 minutes. I may take $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours for my reply. I will make the motion for the same at the appropriate time?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What is the appropriate time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Let us continue the discussion to-day. We will see to-morrow. Sri Y. Veerappa will continue now.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, my Hon. friend Mr. Muckannappa is correct technically speaking. My friend Mr. Narasimhan moved an amendment to the report of the Business Advisory Committee but it was thrown out by the House. If I remember correctly according to the Rules of Procedure, there should be a suspension of normal rules before a motion can be made by the Treasury Benches or on this side for extending the time. Technically, the time would come to an end at 6 to-day. That is Mr. Muckannappa's point. Let us see what happens at 6 P.M.

† ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊಳೆನರಸೀಪುರ).—ವಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಮಹತ್ತರವಾದ ಮನೂವೆಯ ಮೇರೆ ಅನೇಕ ವಾನ್ಯ ಸವನುರು ತಂತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಕೆ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ಮೇರೆ ಹಿವೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ನಡೆದಾಗ ನನ್ನ ಕೆಲವು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆಗಲೇ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಪರಿಶೀಲನಾ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ಹೊರಬಿದ್ದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯ ಮೊದಲೋನ್ನೇತ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಅಂಶವೇ ಈಗ ನೆರವೇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಮನೂವೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವ ಮುಖ್ಯೋದ್ದೇಶ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಹೋತನ್ಯವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಮತ್ತು ಸಮಾಜವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ, ಜನತೆಯ ಒಂದು ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಪ್ರಿಂಗ್ ಎನಿಸಿದೆಯೋ

ಅದನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು. ಆ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೂರೋದ್ದೇಶಗಳು ನೆರವೇರುತ್ತವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಅನುಮಾನಕರವಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವಾಗಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಮನೂವೆಗೆ ದೇಶದ ಜನತೆಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಪುರಸ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾದ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗುರುತರವಾದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವಂತಹ ಮನೂವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳನ್ನು ಅನೇಕ ಸಾರಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವೆಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಾರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಆಪ್ತರಾಗಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚಿನ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದು ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯವಲ್ಲ; ಇದು ಒಂದು ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪ್ರಸಂಗವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸುಖೀ ರಾಜ್ಯವೆಂದರೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ಎರರಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆಂದರೆ, ಸಖಿಯರು ತಾಳಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಗೆಜ್ಜೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಣಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ದೇಶದ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನೇ ಹೊಂದಿರುವ ಇವರೂ ಸಹ ಸಖಿಯರಂತೆ ಈ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ತಾಳ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕುಣಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾರು, ಸಖಿ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರೇ !

ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ಎರರಪ್ಪ.—ಆದಳು ತಕ್ಷಣವರನ್ನು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಸಖಿಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ನಾನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ವಿಷಯಗಳಿವೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರೊಬ್ಬರು 64 ಸಾರಿ ಈ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಸೆರಿ ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ನಡೆದಾಗ ಅದು ಒಂದು ದೊಂಬಿ ಕೂಟವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರೈಸಿನವರ ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೂ ಒದಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಏನೇ ಇರಲಿ ಈಗ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂರೋದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಗೊಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮುಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನರು ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಭೂಕ್ಕಿನರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶೇಕಡ ಎಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗದ ಜನರು ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಚಿನೆಂಟುಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಂತೆ ಉಳುವವನೇ ಒಡೆಯನಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಈಗ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಬೆಂಬಲವೂ ಇದೆ, ಆದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಮಹತ್ವರವಾದ ಮನೂವೆಗಳನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಈ ಮಹಾ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಜನಗಳು ಈ ಮನೂವೆಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪುರಸ್ಕಾರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಅವರ ಸೆಪ್ಪಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನೆಹರೂರವರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಈಗ ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ರಾಯಕರೂ ಸಹ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲೆಂತಹ ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವೇನಿದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಜನರಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸರಿಸಮವಾಗಿ ಹಂಚುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಸಮಾಜವನ್ನು ಸುಭದ್ರವಾದ ಅಡಿಗಲ್ಲಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ತತ್ವಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾರುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರೋಷ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ರಂಗಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಈ ಭೂ ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಕೃಷಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಈ ಭೂಮಿ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯ ರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು

(ಶ್ರೀ ವೈ. ವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೆಂಸಿಟಿವಿಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಜನಗಳ ಬೆಂಬಲ ದೊರಕದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಕಠಿಣವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರಯೋಜನವೇನು? ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಜನಗಳಿಂದ ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಪುರಸ್ಕಾರ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆದಾಯ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರ ಯಾವ್ಯಾವ ಕನುಬಿನ ಮೇಲೆ ಇವರು ಈ ಸೀಲಿಂಗುಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಇವರ ಗಮನ ಆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಲೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಸಾರುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1958 ರಿಂದ ತೀರಾ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂಸೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಈ ಭೂ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯ ಮನೂವೆಯನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವಾರು ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳಹೊಕ್ಕು, ತೀಕ್ಷ್ಣವಾಗಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಮನೂವೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯತೆ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಘಟಾಘೋಷವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇಲ್ಲದವರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಗಾರರಿಗೂ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಗೋಚರವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗದ ಜಮೀನು ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದರೆ ಅದೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಅದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. Effective utilisation of land that is available readily ಎಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಇವರು ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳು ವರ್ಷಾನುಗಟ್ಟಲೆಯಿಂದ ನಾನಾ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಪಾಳು ಬಿದ್ದಿವೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet again to-morrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Six of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Wednesday, the 6th September 1961.